DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 162 IR 009 115

AUTHOR Gantz, Walter
TITLE Uses and Gratifications Associated with Exposure to Public Television.
INSTITUTION Corporation for Public Broadcasting, Washington, D.C. Office of Communication Research.
REPORT NO ISBN-0-89776-044-1
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 51p.: Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Attitude Measures: *Audiences: Educational Television: Interviews: Media Research: *Motivation: *Public Television: Questionnaires: Television Surveys: *Television Viewing: Use Studies

ABSTRACT

Designed to assess the motivations viewers have for watching public television (PTV), the gratifications they derive from programs they enjoy, and their expectations of PTV, the pilot study described was conducted to provide information for program decision-making and efforts aimed at attracting different types of audiences. The research strategy involved three phases of data collection: (1) focus group sessions, (2) pre-test telephone interviews, and (3) telephone interviews, which were based on a survey instrument including a researcher and respondent-generated list of 19 motivations and corresponding gratifications for watching PTV. Results indicated that PTV viewing seems to be motivated primarily by the desire for a change of pace from commercial TV fare, and the related expectation of being entertained by intelligent, well written, well acted, and well produced programming. The multidimensional nature of PTV viewing motivations and gratifications contradicted the stereotyped unidimension image of PTV as a dull, demanding instructional/educational service. (MER)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED205162

USES AND GRATIFICATIONS ASSOCIATED WITH EXPOSURE TO PUBLIC TELEVISION

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

A Report Prepared

by

Walter Gantz

for

Office of Communication Research
Corporation for Public Broadcasting

March 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Howard A. Myrick

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR009115

DEC 30 1980

© Copyright 1980
Corporation for Public Broadcasting
1111 Sixteenth Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036
An Equal Opportunity Employer — M/F

ISBN: 0-89776-044-1

This report is solely the work of its author. Its publication by the Corporation does not constitute an endorsement of the views and conclusions contained therein.

PREFACE

In public broadcasting, programming decisions are uniquely motivated by concerns for delivering programs to audiences, rather than delivering audiences to sponsors or advertisers. In this sense, knowledge about the audience's expectations, uses and anticipated gratifications is indispensable to informed decision-making.

While there are no immutable laws which dictate the audience's reactions to programs and which will guarantee optimal production and programming decisions, there are some observed and researchable tendencies in viewers' uses of television which are useful to program decision-making.

Studies of television viewing uses and gratifications, studies which delve into the motivations viewers have for watching public television, the gratifications they derive from programs they enjoy, and their expectations of public television can, for example, guide promotional efforts aimed at attracting different types of audiences and can be of immeasurable assistance to program managers and producers.

Such are the concerns and interests which motivated the conduct of this present study, Uses And Gratifications Associated With Exposure To Public Television. We hope that our readers will find it useful in the successful pursuit of their audience-based objectives.

Howard A. Myrick
Director, Office of
Communication Research

Carol Keegan
Project Officer
Associate Director, Office
of Communication Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction 1

The Uses and Gratifications Approach 2

Value of the Approach 2

Concerns About the Approach 4

Research Methodology 7

Phase 1: Focus Group Sessions 7

Phase 2: Pre-Test Telephone Interview 9

Phase 3: Telephone Interviews Addressing the Research Questions 11

Results 17

Descriptive Analyses: Public Television Viewing Motivations 17

Gratifications Associated with Exposure to Public Television 21

Importance of Motivations: Public vs. Commercial Television ... 26

Factor Analysis 3

Discussion 3

Appendix 3

INTRODUCTION

Exposure to public television appears to be a relatively infrequent, isolated and carefully selected activity. Unlike commercial television, there is little "audience flow" from one program to the next. Instead, individuals within families appear to turn to a particular public television program and then return to commercial television programming. Moreover, many tend to avoid public television altogether. Public television still is equated with educational television and long-winded round-table discussions, neither of which seems appealing to prime-time viewers. In a recent qualitative study, respondents characterized public television as humorless, unexciting, too demanding, not relaxing, too repetitious, technically amateurish, too British and too locally-oriented to be of much interest to them. Why then do people watch public television? What are the range and underlying dimensions of uses/motivations/expected gratifications associated with public television viewing? Is exposure to public television a more purposive activity than exposure to commercial television? What is the range of gratifications or satisfactions actually obtained following exposure to public television? To what extent does public television meet viewer expectations? The pilot study described in this report was designed to begin to address those questions.

C

THE USES AND GRATIFICATIONS APPROACH

"Uses and gratifications" is a research approach which examines the expectations and uses of communication media and the gratifications and (perhaps unintended) consequences associated with such usage. Generally, the approach involves a straightforward ascertainment of media uses and gratifications from the viewers themselves. While the approach has been employed to predict communication effects, it has been used extensively as a descriptive device, cataloging and providing typologies of motivations and gratifications. It is in its latter capacity that the approach is being utilized in this investigation.

Value of the Approach

As a descriptive tool, uses and gratifications provide relevant information along a number of dimensions for public television decision-makers. It can:

(1) Document distinct functions of public and commercial television. One of public television's tasks is to provide an alternative to commercial television. Translated in terms of uses and gratifications, public television is supposed to be catering not only to the viewing motivations met by commercial television but also some set of those not met for which television may be of some value. Does public television do this? Are viewers differentially motivated when they watch commercial and public television? The uses and

gratifications approach is capable of documenting the extent to which public and commercial television viewing motivations overlap. It also can specify the motivations or functions that are more fully or uniquely met by commercial and public television.

(2) Document viewing satisfactions. From a gratifications or outcomes perspective, public television as the alternative service should be providing not only those gratifications derived from exposure to commercial television but some other set which television may be capable of providing. Does exposure to public television provide any satisfactions? What are they and how frequently are they obtained? To what extent are they mere mirrors of the gratifications obtained during and following exposure to commercial television? The uses and gratifications approach can document the type, uniqueness, extent and frequency with which gratifications are derived from exposure to public television programming.

(3) Serve as a programming tool. Information on uses and gratifications can be of service to programming development and scheduling personnel. First, if one operates at least in part on the principle "offer people programs that turn them on and tune them in," knowledge of the uses of television should be of value in the conceptualization and refinement of program ideas. Programs can be geared to meet viewer needs. Second, uses and gratifications data provide viewer perceptions of programs. For the programmer interested in scheduling continuity from program to program as a means of enhancing audience flow, uses and gratifications data may provide an additional vantage point in terms of the (dis)similarity across programs. If, for example, one were interested in establishing theme nights, programs used for similar purposes and/or providing similar gratifications might be logical candidates for appearing back to back.

(4) Serve as a promotional tool. When viewers turn to a specific television program, it's because they know what to expect based on seeing it previously or because they have some idea about it based on media promotion of the program. More often than not, people have no direct experiences with particular public television programs and are forced to rely on what they think the show will offer. Uses and gratifications data can suggest linkages betwee elements of a program and important television viewing motivations. Those elements of the program can then be promoted. In this way, the public would become aware of programs (seemingly) consistent with their viewing interests.

On a pragmatic level, the first two functions of the uses and gratifications approach can provide some justification for the continued funding and existence of public broadcasting by demonstrating it serves unique functions and provides gratifications not met by commercial television. If this can be demonstrated, there may be increased acceptance of, if not justification for, the small Nielsen numbers. The second two functions may reduce the need to justify small Nielsens by serving to increase viewership to public television programming.

Concerns About the Approach

The uses and gratifications approach has been carefully scrutinized and criticized. These concerns are worthy of notation and should be remembered when considering using the uses and gratifications approach or examining uses and gratifications methods and data. Included are the following:

(1) Assumptions made about the audience as viewers and survey respondents First, the audience is conceived of as active, with media use goal-directed. Second, viewers are seen as somehow in touch with their viewing motivations and capable of verbalizing them when asked. Finally, researchers antic

that viewers will be willing to discuss their viewing motivations, honestly, when asked either in person, or, more likely, on the telephone. It is difficult to test these assumptions other than by examining the face validity of responses.

(2) Superficial examination of motivations and gratifications. There are a number of motivations and gratifications associated with exposure to television. Given budgetary and respondent fatigue restraints, only so many questions can be addressed in any one survey to any one respondent. As the number of motivations under consideration increases, each motivation receives less time and consideration. The result may be a superficial examination of each motivation.

(3) Artificial creation of motivation states. How many viewing motivations are there? Hopefully, respondents acknowledge those motivations that lead them to watching television. However, respondents may also say yes to motivations they never considered before but which make sense when stated as motivations by the researcher. Moreover, for any motivation, a small number of respondents may say yes because the motivation fits in with their almost idiosyncratic uses of television. Motivations for viewing (in this case) public television may be a function of the number and type of motivations included in the study.

(4) Questionable validity of responses. First, unless carefully worded and clearly distinguishable, motivation and gratification combinations may be viewed as interchangeable by respondents. Second, even if clear on paper, respondents may confuse reasons for using the media with satisfactions obtained. Do responses accurately reflect what the viewer wants or gets? Third, levels of social desirability and stigma may be affixed to each motivation. Responses may be artificially high for motivations perceived of as socially desirable and artificially low for those seen as inappropriate. Finally, the relative

strength of particular motivations and their underlying dimensional structure may be a function of the inclusiveness and representativeness of the motivations studied.

(5) Effort involved in collecting uses and gratifications data. In order to maximize the inclusiveness of uses and gratifications lists and insure linguistically recognizable sets of motivations and gratifications from the respondent's perspective, several waves of data collection may be required. Moreover, each wave may involve a series of questions for each motivation or gratification item. It may be quite unwieldy, then, to amalgamate uses and gratifications and other research questions into a single, multi-purpose research endeavor.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

With the potential shortcomings of the uses and gratifications approach in mind, a research strategy was developed. The design and procedures used in this pilot study were based on the supposition that viewers can deal with the reasons and outcomes associated with their exposure to public television programming. However, it also was assumed that in unaided, open-ended question situations, respondents would encounter some difficulty verbalizing extensive lists of motivations and gratifications and would tend to cite those most obvious and/or socially acceptable (e.g., watching for information or cultural enrichment). The research strategy involved three phases of data collection. These phases were: (1) focus group sessions, (2) pre-test telephone interviews, and (3) telephone interviews addressing the research questions guiding this investigation. Each phase will be examined in detail.

Phase 1

Focus Group Sessions. The purpose of the focus groups sessions was to generate public television viewing motivation and gratification items. Three focus group sessions were conducted in the Fall, 1979. Participants were adults who watched public television at least a couple of times a month. Each was promised and received cash for participating. The sessions focused on why the participants watched public television programming, what gratifications

they obtained from exposure, and how the public television viewing experience for them differed from their use of commercial television. If particular motivations (e.g., to be entertained) were not spontaneously mentioned by the participants, they were brought up by the discussion leader toward the end of the group session and discussed. Each session ran approximately 90 minutes. Sessions were audio tape-recorded, although the focus group leader occasionall took notes during the session as well. Following the third session, responses were transformed to fit the specifics and demands of getting people to relate and react to motivation and gratification items on the telephone. What follows is a list of those motivations and some of the specifics mentioned by the focus group participants.

Because I hope to see something new and different: It's a change from what I normally watch; to see something other than sit-coms; public television uses different formats

Because I think the shows will not be an insult to my intelligence: they're not moronic; the questions are more challenging

To watch top quality productions and acting: the acting is great; the productions are professional

To be challenged in figuring out what is going to happen or what someone is going to say: I like to match wits with the program; the shows are less predictable; to guess outcomes

Because I think the programs either will be real or realistic; they're not contrived; not unbelievable

To feel cultured: it gives me a sense of experiencing culture; I enjoy the beauty of ballet; it's good music

To really get to know a person or topic: informative like The New York Times; it's not the 5 minute Johnny Carson bit; you can really get to know the person interviewed; it lets you get below the surface

To give me helpful consumer information: serves as a guide for what I buy and avoid

To pick up information related to my own interests or work: What I se I can use at work; it fits in with what I like to do

To give me something to think about: provides mental stimulation; I come away with something to consider

To develop my tastes and interests: it broadens my horizons; lets me know about things I normally wouldn't be aware of

To avoid commercials or interruptions: nothing else gives uninterrupted programming

Because while it may be interesting, it won't hook me into watching it every night or every week: it's discrete programming; I don't have to worry about scheduling my life to see the next episode

Phase 2

Pre-Test Telephone Interview. There were two purposes of the pre-test telephone interviews. The first purpose was to assess and refine the motivation and gratification items generated in Phase 1. The second purpose was to determine the most viable question format for ascertaining public television motivations and gratifications.

In addition to the public television motivations generated in Phase 1, several motivations not mentioned in the focus group sessions but frequently associated with watching commercial television were included in the pre-test. These were:

To give me something to talk about

To relax

To be emotionally moved or excited

To be entertained

To give me something to watch while I do other things

In short, the pre-test contained 18 motivations (and corresponding gratification items) for respondents to react to.

Two different approaches were used in the pre-test. The first approach examined each motivation as it related to watching public television in general.

For each motivation, questions assessed: (1) its importance in leading to public television viewing, (2) the frequency with which its corresponding gratification was obtained, and (3) its relative importance for public versus commercial television viewing. The second approach examined each motivation as it related to specific public television programs respondents indicated watching at least sometimes. At the outset, there appeared to be strengths and weaknesses with each approach. With the watching public television in general approach, one would be able to talk about an overall orientation to public television. This may be less informative however to officials interested in uncovering why people watch (or what may attract people to watch) specific programs. The reverse is the case with the second approach. There, the problem seemed to be the redundancy and time constraints which might place upper limits on the number of specific programs and motivations that could be presented to any one respondent. It would be difficult then to determine how complete a picture of public television viewing one gets using the second approach.

Pre-test respondents were 50 adults residing in the Indianapolis, Indiana area who watched public television programs broadcast on the Indianapolis public television station (WFYI). Because of the redundancy encountered with both approaches, each respondent reacted to half the motivation and gratification items. After this, respondents were provided an opportunity to offer their reactions to the survey.

Pre-test results and feedback from respondents and interviewers suggested that the response task was easier when comparing motivations to specific programs. However, some respondents seemed tempted to generalize the importance of each motivation across programs without considering each program carefully. On the other hand, while respondents generally seemed and said they were able to differentiate between motivations and gratifications, there was considerable

correspondence in responses to the motivation and gratification questions for each motivation.

Because of budgetary and respondent fatigue restraints, the second approach was discarded. In addition to influencing this decision, pre-test data also were used to sharpen the distinctions between motivation and gratification items and linguistically modify several items so that they were more compatible with viewer/respondent terminology.

Finally, following the pre-test, several motivations were dropped and others included. The motivations dropped were "to avoid commercials or interruptions" and "because while it may be interesting, it won't hook me into watching it every night or every week." The deletion decision was based on the perception that those motivations were negative in nature and on the surface unrelated to public television content, production or viewing uses and gratifications. The motivations added were "because I think the scripts will be well written," "for a change of pace from what is on commercial television" and "it helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel." These were included because they seemed to fill dimensional voids suggested by a multi-dimensional study of viewer perceptions of television.

Phase 3

Telephone Interviews Addressing the Research Questions. The final survey instrument included the researcher and respondent generated list of 19 motivations and corresponding gratifications. Using a close-ended response approach, interviewers asked respondents to react to each motivation in terms of its importance and frequency of occurrence for them when they watched evening public television programming. Respondents also were asked to indicate whether each motivation was more important when they turned to public or commercial

television. There were three questions then for each motivation. Illustrative of the format used is the following:

> To really get to know a person or topic.
> How important is that reason for you? Very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?
>
> How often have these programs let you really get to know about a person or topic? Almost always, most of the time, some of the time, or almost never?
>
> Would you say that reason is more important when you watch WFYI, more important when you watch commercial television, or about as important for both?

In addition to the motivation items, respondent public television viewing patterns were ascertained. Respondents were asked how frequently they watched evening programming on public television, how many public television shows they watched each evening when they watched public television, how many public television programs they watched the night before the interview, and how frequently they watched 10 public television shows which represented the more popular public television programs across several program types. (See Appendix for the entire questionnaire.)

Telephone interviews were conducted with 400 adults residing in the Indianapolis, Indiana area. Half of the respondents were on the membership list of the local public television station (WFYI); half were not but watched evening programming on that station at least once a week. The even member/non-member split was deliberate so as to facilitate examination of the extent to which members were differentially motivated and gratified by public television productions. The member sample was selected using systematic random sampling procedures applied to the station's membership list. The non-member sample was selected using a modified random digit dialing (RDD) procedure, thus insuring access to individuals with listed, new but not listed, and unlisted telephone numbers.

Interviews were conducted in late February and early March, 1980. An independent survey research firm with headquarters in Indianapolis, Indiana collected the data. Professional interviewers, trained for the specifics of this task, were employed. Calls were placed from the firm's central phone bank.

Respondents tended to be well educated, middle aged whites. Public television members were more educated and older than their non-member counterparts. Among non-members, slightly more than half (58.7%) attended college; one-third (36.2%) obtained at least a bachelor's degree. Among members, more than 3 of 4 (84.1%) attended college; 60.7% had at least one college degree. Half of the non-members (51.3%) were at least 40; 21.6% were 60 or older. Two-thirds of the members (68.1%) were at least 40 years old; 35.8% were at least 60. Both groups were overwhelmingly white (92.7% of the non-members, 95% of the members). A slight majority in both groups were women (57.5% of the non-members, 58.7% of the members). These figures are not representative of the adult population residing in the Indianapolis, Indiana area; both samples were more educated, older, and disproportionately white. The disparities reported above are far more likely a function of the characteristics of public television viewers than any problems associated with the sampling procedures utilized. (Table 1 provides an overview of respondent education, age, race, and sex characteristics.)

Members watched more public television than non-members, although watching public television was not a daily activity for most in both samples. More than half of the non-members (56.7%) and one-third of the members (32.0%) watched public television twice a week or less. Fewer than a third watched it at least five times a week (18.6% of the non-members, 32.5% of the members). When the respondents watched public television, it was not an all night affair.

TABLE 1

Demographic Characteristics of the Samples

	Non-Members	Members
Education		
Less than 8th grade	1.5%	0.0%
Some high school	11.7	2.0
High school degree	28.1	13.9
Some college	22.5	23.4
College degree(s)	36.2	60.7
Age		
18-19	2.5%	1.5%
20s	24.6	8.0
30s	21.6	22.4
40s	17.1	12.4
50s	12.6	19.9
60s	14.1	22.9
Older	7.5	12.9
Race		
White	92.5%	95.0%
Non-white	7.5	5.0
Sex		
Male	42.5%	41.3%
Female	57.5	58.7

An overwhelming majority watched one or two public television programs on the nights they watched public television (88.7% of the non-members, 82.6% of the members). Most did not watch any public television the night before the interview (79.0% of the non-members, 63.5% of the members). When given the choices "watch regularly," "watch sometimes," or "watch almost never," the average response across 10 public television programs was "almost never." (Table 2 provides an overview to public television usage patterns among the samples interviewed.)

TABLE 2

Public Television Viewing Patterns

	Non-Members	Members
Frequency of Watching Evening Public Television Programs		
Once a week	27.6%	12.5%
Twice a week	29.1	19.5
Three times a week	19.1	23.5
Four times a week	5.5	12.0
Five times a week	6.0	6.5
Just about every day	12.6	26.0
Number of Public Television Shows Watched When Watching Public Television		
One	43.9%	37.2%
Two	34.8	45.4
Three	9.6	6.1
Four	1.5	2.0
More	1.5	1.0
Varies	8.6	8.2
Number of Public Television Programs Watched Last Night		
None	79.0%	63.5%
One	14.0	22.3
Two	5.5	9.1
Three	1.0	3.0
Four	0.5	2.0
Frequency of Exposure to Each Public Television Show		
Monty Python	.7*	.8*
Washington Week in Review	1.3	1.9
Connections	.6	.7
Nova	1.4	1.7
Masterpiece Theater	1.9	2.1
Dick Cavett	1.4	1.4
McNeil-Lehrer Report	1.1	2.0
Sneak Previews	1.4	1.3
Wall Street Week	1.0	1.7
Great Performances	1.7	1.8

*Where: 0.0 = never 1.0 = almost never 2.0 = sometimes
3.0 = regularly

RESULTS

The data were analyzed in several ways. First, descriptive analyses were performed. This provided an overview of responses to each of the questions asked. Then, responses to the motivation items were factor analyzed. This uncovered the underlying dimensions of motivations associated with public television viewing. Separate sample analyses were conducted for all the data. What follows is a description of the findings.

Descriptive Analyses

Public Television Viewing Motivations. Respondents were asked to evaluate the 19 motivations generated in terms of how important each was for them when they turned to evening programming on public television. Responses suggest that the motivations generated in the focus group sessions were relevant to these respondents in their public television viewing decisions.

The most important motivation was "for a change of pace from what's on commercial television." This is not surprising since public television viewers generally are heavy consumers of commercial television. That motivation was rated by 9 of 10 (89.9% of the non-members, 90.0% of the members) as either "somewhat" or "very important" when they turned to public television; 7 of 10 (69.7% of the non-members, 68.5% of the members) said the motivation was "very important." Three other motivations were rated by at least half of

both samples as "very important." These were: "because I expect the scripts will be well written" (63.3% of the non-members, 70.9% of the members), "to watch top quality productions and acting" (56.1% of the non-members, 66.5% of the members) and "because I think the shows will not be an insult to my intelligence" (58.5% and 63.1% of the non-members and members respectively). Perhaps surprisingly, "to be entertained" was regarded as an important motivation, rated as "very important" by 50.0% of the non-members and 40.3% of the members. In addition to the motivations mentioned above, six other motivations averaged at least "somewhat important" responses from both non-members and members. These were: "because I hope to see something new and different," "to give me something to think about," "because I think the programs either will be real or realistic," "to really get to know a person or topic," "to develop my tastes and interests" and "to pick up information related to my own interest or work."

With the exception of "to be entertained," the motivations taken from the uses and gratifications literature associated with exposure to commercial television were not regarded by these respondents as important. Clearly, these respondents don't watch public television as a secondary activity. When asked to evaluate the importance of the motivation "to give me something to watch while I'm doing other things," most (68.0% of the non-members, 76.5% of the members) rated it as either "not very important" or "not important at all." Only 1 in 10 (11.5% of the non-members, 8.5% of the members) said it was "very important." Public television content may be too engrossing and/or demanding to permit partial attentiveness. Viewers also don't watch public television in order "to give them something to talk about." While this may be because they have other things to talk about or regard what's on public television as not worth talking about, most respondents (63.8% of the non-members,

73.0% of the members) said the motivation either was "not very important" or "not important at all." Only a handful (12.1% of the non-members, 5.0% of the members) said it was "very important." Two other motivations received a majority of "not very important" or "not important at all" responses from at least one of the samples. Those were: "to be emotionally moved or excited" and "it helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel." It is difficult to assess the extent to which responses to motivations like the last two are a function of the content on public television or the perceived social stigma of saying yes to them. If the responses are content based, the data for at least one of these motivations ("to be emotionally moved or excited") would be disappointing for those wanting to produce more drama for public television.

Non-members and members differed in their responses to a number of the motivation items. Non-members were more likely to evaluate the diversionary motivations as more important. These were "to give me something to talk about," "to relax," "to be emotionally moved or excited," "to give me something to watch while I'm doing other things," and "it helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel." They also placed more importance on "to give me helpful consumer information." Members evaluated one cognitive motivation ("to give me someting to think about") as more important. (Table 3 provides responses to each of the motivation items.)

Thus far, responses to the motivation items have been examined in terms of the percentage of respondents selecting particular response choices for individual motivation items. Another approach involves examining the relative importance of the motivations when ranked from most to least important based on the mean response to each motivation. While this obscures the fact that many motivations received similar importance scores, it provides the reader with an

TABLE 3

Motivations for Watching Public Television

Motivation	Non-Members					Members				
	Percent Responding					Percent Responding				
	not impt. at all	not very impt.	some-what impt.	very impt.	$\bar{x}$	not impt. at all	not very impt.	some-what impt.	very impt.	$\bar{x}$
Something to talk about	34.7	29.1	24.1	12.1	2.14	43.5	29.5	22.0	5.0	1.89
See something new	3.5	10.6	38.9	47.0	3.29	4.5	12.9	45.8	36.8	3.15
Be entertained	1.5	10.6	37.9	50.0	3.36	3.0	10.4	46.3	40.3	3.24
Be challenged	9.2	24.0	38.3	28.6	2.86	12.2	25.5	36.7	25.5	2.76
Relax	5.6	14.2	29.9	50.3	3.25	11.0	19.5	40.5	29.0	2.88
Top quality writing	4.0	7.0	25.6	63.3	3.48	3.6	5.6	19.0	70.9	3.58
Feel cultured	11.7	20.8	31.0	36.5	2.92	13.3	14.4	33.3	39.0	2.98
Realistic programs	5.6	14.8	37.8	41.8	3.16	3.6	12.8	39.8	43.9	3.24
Emotionally moved	12.7	28.9	42.1	16.2	2.62	21.1	29.1	38.2	11.6	2.40
Something to think about	4.5	12.0	35.5	48.0	3.27	3.5	7.0	31.0	58.5	3.45
Really know about something	5.0	13.5	43.5	38.0	3.15	2.0	12.6	45.7	39.7	3.23
Top quality production	2.0	7.6	34.3	56.1	3.44	4.0	5.5	24.0	66.5	3.53
Something to watch	35.0	33.0	20.5	11.5	2.09	53.5	23.0	15.0	8.5	1.79
Not an insult	9.5	12.1	19.6	58.8	3.28	8.1	6.6	22.2	63.1	3.40
Relates to work or interests	9.1	18.8	35.0	37.1	3.00	10.7	14.7	35.5	39.1	3.03
Relieve pressure	19.0	21.0	32.0	28.0	2.69	35.5	24.9	26.9	12.7	2.17
Develop tastes	3.0	21.0	34.5	41.5	3.15	7.6	11.6	46.5	34.3	3.08
Consumer information	8.1	15.2	38.6	38.1	3.07	18.5	22.0	32.5	27.0	2.68
Change of pace	4.0	6.1	20.2	69.7	3.56	5.0	5.0	21.5	68.5	3.54

opportunity to easily "eyeball" the motivations in terms of which seem to be the top, middle, and bottom of the list of viewer motivations. From this perspective, the program quality motivations rest near the top, the cognitive motivations in the middle, and the diversion motivations toward the bottom. Differences across the samples generally are trivial. The ranking is substantially different for only one motivation, "to relax," where responses from non-members placed it higher (more important) than members. (See Table 4 for this perspective.)

To summarize, there appear to be a number of important motivations leading people to watch public television. These reasons seem to revolve around some need for a change of pace from what is normally viewed, the expectation of first rate content and production and the anticipation of being cognitively stimulated and entertained. The extent to which these motivations are satisfied is the subject of the next section of the report.

Gratifications Associated with Exposure to Public Television. Respondents were asked to evaluate the frequency with which exposure to public television provided them with the corresponding gratification for each of the 19 motivations assessed. Responses suggest that while public television meets viewer needs and expectations and provides assorted gratifications, the needs and expectations are not met each time the viewer watches public television programming.

Above all, for these respondents, public television is entertaining. When asked "how often have you been entertained" by public television programs, an overwhelming majority of both samples (77.5% of the non-members, 82.0% of the members) said either "most of the time" or "almost always." A sizeable minority (35.5% of the non-members, 41.0% of the members) said "almost always." Being entertained runs counter to the image of public television. There are

TABLE 4

Motivations Ordered by Importance

Motivation	Non-Members	Members
Change of pace	1	2
Top quality writing	2	1
Top quality productions	3	3
Be entertained	4	7
Not an insult	5	5
See something new	6	9
Something to think about	7	4
Relax	8	13
Realistic programs	9	6
Really know about something	10	8
Develop tastes	11	10
Consumer information	12	15
Relates to work or interests	13	11
Feel cultured	14	12
Be challenged	15	14
Relieve pressure	16	17
Emotionally moved	17	16
Something to talk about	18	18
Something to watch	19	19

several alternative explanations for this finding. On one hand, it may be that the public's perception of public television is inaccurate; if they were to watch, they would find themselves entertained. On the other hand, it may be that the public television viewer's definition of entertainment is different than that of the non-viewer. As one focus group participant stated, "Learning something is entertaining." From this perspective, public television is entertaining, but only to some subset of people who define entertainment rather broadly.

No gratification items were mentioned by at least half of both samples as occurring "almost always." In addition to "being entertained," three gratifications occurred on the average at least "most of the time" for both samples. These were: "the scripts have been well written," "these programs had top quality production and acting" and "these programs seemed a change of pace from what's on commercial television." These gratifications correspond to the most important public television viewing motivations. Three other gratifications were rated by either one or the other of the samples as occurring on the average at least "most of the time." These were: "these shows have not been an insult to your intelligence," "these programs actually gave you something to think about" and "these programs actually offered you something new and different." These gratifications correspond with the motivation items rated by the respondents as fairly important. (Table 5 provides responses to each of the gratification items. Table 6 provides a rank ordering of the gratifications for "eyeballing" purposes.)

As the data in the preceding paragraph suggest, responses to the motivation and corresponding gratification items were interrelated. The most important motivations were those which provided gratifications frequently. (For a cursory appraisal of this, compare Tables 4 and 6.) This correspondence

TABLE 5

Gratifications Obtained from Exposure to Public Television

Gratification	Non-Members					Members				
	Percent Responding					Percent Responding				
	almost never at all	some of the time	most of the time	almost always	$\bar{x}$	almost never at all	some of the time	most of the time	almost always	$\bar{x}$
Something to talk about	6.5	62.0	24.0	7.5	2.33	8.5	52.8	20.6	18.1	2.48
See something new	1.0	25.5	45.5	28.0	3.01	1.5	28.1	41.2	29.1	2.98
Be entertained	0.5	22.0	42.0	35.5	3.13	0.5	17.5	41.0	41.0	3.23
Be challenged	9.9	40.6	42.2	7.3	2.47	14.1	52.1	25.0	8.9	2.29
Relax	8.1	33.5	43.7	14.7	2.65	11.8	41.5	33.3	13.3	2.48
Top quality writing	2.1	12.4	57.0	28.5	3.12	0.0	7.1	63.3	29.6	3.22
Feel cultured	7.3	41.1	34.9	16.7	2.61	9.5	32.1	35.8	22.6	2.72
Realistic programs	2.6	25.0	57.7	14.8	2.85	1.0	26.0	55.6	17.3	2.89
Emotionally moved	7.1	58.4	31.5	3.0	2.31	13.4	61.9	20.1	4.6	2.16
Something to think about	3.0	28.6	51.3	17.1	2.82	0.0	23.0	50.5	26.5	3.04
Really know about something	5.6	35.4	45.5	13.6	2.67	3.0	32.7	47.7	16.6	2.78
Top quality productions	1.0	16.8	59.9	22.3	3.04	1.0	14.2	49.7	35.0	3.19
Something to watch	40.0	35.0	19.0	6.0	1.91	38.5	43.5	11.0	7.0	1.87
Not an insult	19.2	9.1	40.9	30.8	2.83	11.8	5.6	44.6	37.9	3.09
Relates to work or interests	12.6	37.7	40.7	9.0	2.46	6.6	46.2	33.0	14.2	2.55
Relieve pressure	25.6	39.2	24.6	10.6	2.20	29.8	50.3	14.1	5.8	1.96
Develop tastes	8.0	37.0	41.5	13.5	2.61	7.2	41.8	35.6	15.5	2.59
Consumer information	10.6	45.5	36.9	7.1	2.40	18.1	49.2	23.8	8.8	2.23
Change of pace	4.0	15.0	47.5	33.5	3.11	1.0	12.4	41.8	44.8	3.30

TABLE 6

Gratifications Ordered by Frequency of Occurrence

	Non-Members	Members
Be entertained	1	2
Top quality writing	2	3
Change of pace	3	1
Top quality productions	4	4
See something new	5	7
Realistic programs	6	8
Not an insult	7	5
Something to think about	8	6
Really know about something	9	9
Relax	10	13
Feel cultured	11	10
Develop tastes	12	11
Be challenged	13	15
Relates to work or interests	14	12
Consumer information	15	16
Something to talk about	16	14
Emotionally moved	17	17
Relieve pressures	18	18
Something to watch	19	19

does not appear to be a function of respondent inability to distinguish between motivation and gratification items. Rather, it may be that over time, viewers learn what to expect and shape their motivations accordingly. However, at the risk of making an apples and oranges comparison, viewers appeared to be more highly motivated than frequently gratified. While viewers associated a number of gratifications with their exposure to public television, no gratification occurred "almost always" for most viewers.

Importance of Motivations: Public vs. Commercial Television. After evaluating each motivation and corresponding gratification, respondents were asked whether the motivation was more important when they watched public television, commercial television, or about as important for both. Except for one motivation ("to give me something to watch while I'm doing other things"), respondents in both samples said the motivations were more important when they watched public television. The difference was marginal for some motivations, with most respondents saying the motivations were equally important when they turned to public and commercial television. Those motivations tended to center around entertainment and diversion. For example, among non-members for the motivation "it helps relieve some of the work or family pressures I feel," whereas 4.6% said it was more important when they watched commercial television and 14.6% said it was more important when they watched public television, 81.0% said it was equally important for their public and commercial television viewing. For most motivations though, the additional percentage of respondents saying public television was substantial. For example, among members for the motivation "to see something new and different," while no one said commercial television and 31.4% said the motivation was equally important for public and commercial television, 68.6% said it was more important when they turned to public television. (Table 7 provides a breakdown of responses to the relative

importance question for each motivation. Table 8 indicates the extent to which respondents said the motivations were more important for public television.) Members were more likely than non-members to say the motivations were more important when they watched public television. Illustrative of this is the motivation "to give me something to think about." There, while 32.0% of the non-members said it was more important when they turned to public television, an additional 21.5% of the members (53.5%) chose the public television response. (See Table 8 again.) In fact, while no motivation was cited by 50% of the non-members as more important when they watched public television, nearly half of the motivations were cited by at least 50% of the members as more important when they watched public television. (See Table 9 for a list of those motivations.)

Given the frequency and magnitude of the differences in favor of public television, one may wonder for a moment about the validity of these responses. Were respondents simply trying to please the interviewers and the Corporation? For several reasons, this researcher suspects not. First, the percentage of respondents who said the motivation was more important for public television varied from motivation to motivation. Second, the variance in responses across motivations makes intuitive sense. Given the content on public and commercial television, one would anticipate entertainment and diversion motivations being equally important for public and commercial television and cognitive, culture and program quality motivations more important for public television.

In short, the viewing motivations assessed seem to be more important when turning to public television. This may indicate that public and commercial television are viewed with different sets of expectations. It may also indicate that public television is viewed for the satisfaction of needs not met by commercial television. However, whether viewers are more motivated

TABLE 7

Importance of Motivations: Commercial vs. Public Television

Motivation	Non-Members			Members		
	More impt. for PTV	Equally impt.	More impt. for CTV	More impt. for PTV	Equally impt.	More impt. for CTV
Something to talk about	33.0	63.4	3.7	48.2	49.2	2.6
See something new	39.6	59.9	0.5	68.6	31.4	0.0
Be entertained	22.7	72.2	5.1	34.2	59.7	6.1
Be challenged	25.0	74.0	1.0	42.1	55.2	2.7
Relax	18.7	74.2	7.1	28.0	60.8	11.1
Top quality writing	30.8	68.7	0.5	50.3	49.2	0.5
Feel cultured	34.5	65.5	0.0	65.8	34.2	0.0
Realistic programs	31.6	68.4	0.0	46.1	52.3	1.6
Emotionally moved	15.3	82.7	2.0	25.0	71.8	3.2
Something to think about	32.0	66.5	1.5	53.5	46.0	0.5
Really know about something	32.3	66.7	1.0	45.4	53.6	1.0
Top quality productions	32.3	65.7	2.0	49.7	48.7	1.5
Something to watch	10.8	70.1	19.1	17.0	56.9	26.1
Not an insult	37.8	61.7	0.5	58.3	41.1	0.5
Relates to work or interests	27.9	70.1	2.0	51.8	47.2	1.0
Relieve pressures	14.4	81.0	4.6	14.8	80.2	4.9
Develop tastes	33.2	64.8	2.0	52.1	46.9	1.0
Consumer information	21.9	73.5	4.6	30.3	63.3	6.4

TABLE 8

Importance of Motivations: Commercial vs. Public Television

	Additional Percentage of Respondents Saying the Motivation is More Important for Public Television	
	Non-Members	Members
See something new	+39	+69
Not an insult	+37	+57
Feel cultured	+35	+66
Realistic programs	+32	+44
Develop tastes	+31	+51
Really know about something	+31	+44
Top quality productions	+30	+48
Something to think about	+30	+53
Top quality writing	+30	+50
Something to talk about	+29	+45
Relates to work or interests	+26	+51
Be challenged	+24	+39
Be entertained	+17	+28
Consumer information	+17	+24
Emotionaliy moved	+13	+22
Relax	+12	+17
Relieve pressures	+10	+10
Something to watch	- 8	- 9

TABLE 9

Motivations for Which Over 50% of the Sample Said Were More Important for Public Television

Non-Members	Members
None	See something new
	Feel cultured
	Not an insult
	Something to think about
	Develop tastes
	Relates to work or interests
	Top quality writing
	Top quality productions

when they turn to public television and/or gratified when they watch it remains unanswered.

Factor Analysis

A varimax factor analysis procedure (SPSS Principal Factoring with Iterations) was utilized to compute the underlying dimensions of public television viewing motivations. Standard factor analysis criteria were employed; each factor had to have a minimum eigenvalue of 1.0 and a minimum of two variables with their highest loading on it, the loadings themselves at least .50. Using these criteria, three factor solutions emerged for both the non-member and member samples. However, the factors did not account for a substantial proportion of the variance in responses. As such, many of the motivation items were, at best, nominally loaded on the factors. Moreover, while there were three factor solutions for both samples, there were differences in individual loadings on the factors. (See Table 10 for the factor loadings.) This resulted in different factors and different components in similar factors across the samples.

For non-members, the underlying dimensions of motivations appear to be cognitive interest, quality of the content offered, and diversion. For members, the underlying dimensions appear to be cognitive interest, diversion, and production value of the programming. For non-members, cognitive interest centered on two motivations--"to develop my tastes and interests" and "to give me something to think about." For members, three motivations loaded well on their cognitive interest dimension. One overlapped with the non-member cognitive interest factor--"to give me something to think about." The two which didn't overlap were "to really get to know a person or topic" and "to pick up information related to my own interest or work." For non-members, quality of the

TABLE 10

Factor Analysis: Factor Loading Scores*

Motivation	Non-Members			Members		
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Something to talk about	.46	-.06	.14	.07	.09	-.08
See something new	.30	.28	.18	.09	.28	-.10
Be entertained	.04	.03	.34	-.08	.42	.25
Be challenged	.45	.24	.13	.30	.12	.10
Relax	.10	.12	.75	.01	.61	.07
Top quality writing	.23	.61	.12	.05	.04	.77
Feel cultured	.37	.14	.08	.18	.08	.15
Realistic programs	.16	.45	-.09	.34	.30	-.12
Emotionally moved	.31	-.02	.52	.09	.36	.19
Something to think about	.51	.17	.10	.57	.04	-.01
Really know about something	.21	.24	.04	.67	-.02	.10
Top quality productions	.07	.08	.12	.11	.12	.58
Something to watch	-.01	-.01	.18	.05	.01	.08
Not an insult	.16	.56	.08	.11	-.03	.17
Relates to work or interests	.35	.16	.07	.60	.02	.07
Relieve pressure	.15	.20	.53	-.01	.60	-.12
Develop tastes	.63	.17	.05	.18	.11	.10
Consumer information	.16	.14	.06	.12	.07	-.08
Change of pace	.03	.51	.11	.06	.16	.07

*Based on varimax rotated factor matrix

content offered was characterized by "because I expect the scripts to be well written," "because I think the shows will not be an insult to my intelligence" and "for a change of pace from what's on commercial television." "Because I expect the scripts to be well written" when combined with "to watch top quality productions and acting" fit with the member's production value dimension. For both non-members and members, diversion appears to be a mix of the "to relax" and "it helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel" motivations, with non-members also including "to be emotionally moved or excited" and members including "to be entertained." (For comparison of the major elements in each of the factors, see Table 11.)

Factor analysis requires a number of arbitrary decisions and involves a fair amount of groping in the dark as one tries to find patterns in the data and then appropriate names for the patterns. It has been called a fishing expedition which takes many down unproductive streams. Thus, while the 19 motivations for these samples of public television viewers seem to boil down to expectations of quality programming, relevant mental stimulation and diversion, the reader is reminded that what has emerged is a function of the motivations studied, the analysis criteria utilized and the labeling abilities of this researcher.

TABLE 11

Underlying Dimensions of PTV Viewing Motivations

Non-Members	Members
Cognitive Interest Develop tastes Something to think about	Cognitive Interest Really know about something Relates to work or interests Something to think about
Quality of Content Top quality writing Not an insult Change of pace	Diversion Relax Forget about pressures Be entertained
Diversion Relax Forget about pressures Emotionally moved	Production Value Top quality writing Top quality productions

DISCUSSION

As might be expected, among viewers, public television viewing is a highly motivated and frequently gratifying experience. Uses and gratifications are diverse, as is the case with commercial television. However, many motivations generally associated with exposure to commercial television do not appear to be important for public television. Instead, public television viewing seems to be primarily motivated by the desire for a viewing change of pace and the related expectation of being entertained by intelligent, well written, acted and produced programming. These expectations are met fairly frequently. The multidimensional nature of public television viewing motivations and gratifications contradicts the stereotyped unidimensional image of public television as a dull, demanding instructional/educational service. Most surprising in this regard is the importance placed on being entertained and the frequency with which viewers are in fact entertained.

These data could provide corporate officials with salient information for yearly appropriations hearings in the Congress. Public television is seen as an alternative to commercial television and is used as a viewing change of pace. Public television is seen as providing quality programming and is watched because of it. Public television is seen as providing intellectual and aesthetic stimulation. It is not generally seen or used as an escape mechanism.

These data provide useful information for public television promotion units. Public television is entertaining. Extensive promotion of this seems warranted. Perhaps if the public's perception of public television changes, their viewing habits will change as well.

These data are less useful for program development and evaluation personnel. Because motivations and gratifications were assessed on an in-general rather than program-specific basis, it is difficult to examine the match between viewing motivations and gratifications and program content and goals. Why, for example, doesn't public television emotionally move viewers with any degree of frequency? Is it because viewers don't generally turn to public television to be emotionally moved or because on the occasions they do, the content viewed doesn't provide it? Without a program by program analysis, programming personnel are forced to rely more heavily on rather sterile Nielsen numbers and their own judgments in determining what types of programs ought to be aired and how particular programs might be more finely tuned.

These data also aren't particularly useful in the construction of a qualitative counterpoint to the Nielsen numbers. While Nielsen numbers refer to individual shows, the referent for these data is public television. When operationalized on a program-specific basis, however, the uses and gratifications approach may provide the structure for such a measure. One possibility would involve assessing, on a program specific basis, the extent to which expectations associated with commercial and public television were met. The qualitative index for each program would be the sum of the gratification elements.

Finally, results from this study raise many questions about the rates and patterns of exposure to public television. If public television provides as many gratifications as the data suggest, why don't people watch public

television more often? What is the relationship between gratifications obtained and exposure patterns? Are the programs that provide the most gratifications the programs that are watched most frequently? What gratifications must be obtained for viewers to watch the daily programs and series more frequently? What gratifications must be obtained for viewers to sample other public television programs? What gratifications must be obtained for viewers to tell others to watch? If public television is as gratifying as the data suggest, why isn't commercial television the change of pace? What is it that commercial television offers in addition to what public television offers that makes it so much more frequently watched? Answers to these questions await thoughtful discussion and additional investigation.

APPENDIX

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in Washington, D.C. Right now, we're calling adults in the Indianapolis area who watch evening programs on WFYI, Channel 20 at least once a week, trying to find out why they watch those programs. Do you or does any adult in your house watch WFYI, Channel 20 evening programs at least once a week?

(IF YES) We have ten minutes of questions and we'd be very grateful for your help.

(IF NOT THAT PERSON BUT SOMEONE ELSE) May I speak to him/her please?

(WHEN THAT PERSON COMES TO THE PHONE)

Hello, my name is _____ and I'm calling for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting in Washington, D.C. Right now, we're calling adults in the Indianapolis area who watch evening programs on WFYI, Channel 20, at least once a week, trying to find out why they watch those programs. I understand you watch Channel 20 programs at least once a week. Is that correct? (IF YES) We have ten minutes of questions and we'd be very grateful for your help.

(IF NO ONE AT THAT NUMBER WATCHES) Thanks anyhow. Have a good evening.

Respondent ID _____ 1-4

Interviewer _____

Interviewee phone number _____

Day of the week 1 Sun 2 Mon 3 Tues 4 Wed 5 Thurs 6 Fri 7 Sat 5

1. First, about how often do you watch evening programs on WFYI, Channel 20? Once, twice, three, four or five times a week, or just about every day? 6
   1 once 2 twice 3 three 4 four 5 five 6 daily 8 dk

2. When you watch WFYI during the evening, about how many shows do you watch? One, two, three, four or more? 7
   1 one 2 two 3 three 4 four 5 more 7 varies 8 dk

3. How many shows, if any, did you watch on WFYI last night? 8
   0 none 1 one 2 two 3 three 4 four 5 more 8 dk

4. I'm going to read a short list of shows broadcast on WFYI. For each show, tell me if you watch it regularly, sometimes, or almost never.
   (3 = REGULARLY 2 = SOMETIMES 1 = ALMOST NEVER 0 = NEVER 8 = DK)

Monty Python	____	9
Washington Week in Review	____	10
Connections	____	11
Nova	____	12
Masterpiece Theater	____	13
Dick Cavett	____	14
McNeil Lehrer Report	____	15
Sneak Previews	____	16
Wall Street Week	____	17
Great Performances	____	18

What I'm going to do now is read a list of reasons other people gave us for watching public television. We're interested in relating these reasons to why you watch evening programs on WFYI, Channel 20. After I read each reason, I'll ask a few questions, OK?

5. The first reason is to give me something to talk about. How important is that reason for you? Very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all? 19
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

6. How often have these programs actually given you something to talk about? Almost always, most of the time, some of the time, or almost never? 20
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

7. Would you say that reason is more important when you watch WFYI, more important when you watch commercial television, or about as important for both? 21
   3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

8. The second reason is because I hope to see something new and different. For you, is that reason very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all?
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

9. How often have these programs actually offered you something new and different? Almost always, most of the time, some of the time, or almost never? 23
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

10. Would you say that reason is more important when you watch WFYI, more important when you watch commercial television, or about as important for both? 24
   3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

11. To be entertained.
Is that very important, somewhat important, not very important or not important at all? 25
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

12. How often have you been entertained by these programs. Almost always, most of the time, some of the time, or almost never? 26
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

13. Is that reason more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 27
   3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

14. To be challenged in figuring out what's going to happen or what someone's going to say.
Is that very important, somewhat important, not very important, or not important at all? 28
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

15. How often have you been challenged in figuring out what's going to happen or what someone's going to say? 29
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

16. Is that reason more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 30
   3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

17. To relax.
How important is that reason? 31
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

18. How often have those programs made you feel relaxed? 32
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

19. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 33
   3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

20. Because I expect the scripts will be well written.
How important is that reason? 34
   4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

21. How often have the scripts been well written? 35
   4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

22. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 36
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

23. To feel cultured.
How important is that reason? 37
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

24. How often have these programs made you feel cultured? 38
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

25. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 39
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

26. Because I think the programs either will be real or realistic.
How important is that reason? 40
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

27. How often have these shows seemed real or realistic? 41
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

28. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 42
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

29. To be emotionally moved or excited.
How important is that reason? 43
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

30. How often have you been emotionally moved or excited by those programs? 44
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

31. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 45
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

32. To give me something to think about.
How important is that reason? 46
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

33. How often have these programs actually given you something to think about? 47
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

34. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 48
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

35. To really get to know a person or topic.
How important is that reason? 49
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

36. How often have these programs let you really get to know about a person or topic? 50
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 almost never 8 dk

37. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 51
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

38. To watch top quality productions and acting.
How important is that reason? 52
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

39. How often have these programs had top quality production and acting? 53
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 almost never 8 dk

40. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 54
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

41. To give me something to watch while I'm doing other things.
How important is that reason? 55
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

42. How often have you done other things while you watched programs on WFYI? 56
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

43. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial television, or about as important for both? 57
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

44. Because I think the shows will not be an insult to my intelligence.
How important is that reason? 58
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

45. How often have the shows not been an insult to your intelligence? 59
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

46. Is that more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 60
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

47. To pick up information related to my own interest or work?
How important is that reason? 61
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

48. How often have you picked up information from these shows related to your own interest or work? 62
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

49. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 63
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

50. It helps relieve for a while some of the work or family pressures I feel. How important is that reason? 64
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

51. How often have these programs helped relieve some of the work or family pressures you feel? 65
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

52. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 66
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

53. To develop my tastes and interests. How important is that reason? 67
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

54. How often have these programs developed tastes and interests for you? 68
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

55. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 69
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

56. To give me helpful consumer information. How important is that reason? 70
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

57. How often have these programs given you information that's been helpful to you as a consumer? 71
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 never 8 dk

58. Is it more important when you watch WFYI, commercial TV, or about as important for both? 72
3 public 2 same 1 commercial 8 dk

59. For a change of pace from what's on commercial television. How important is that reason? 73
4 very 3 somewhat 2 not very 1 not at all 8 dk

60. How frequently have these programs seemed a change of pace from what's on commercial television? 74
4 always 3 most 2 some 1 almost never 8 dk

The final few questions are about yourself.

61. What is your age? Are you in your 20s, 30s, 40s, 50s, 60s or older? 75
1 18-19 2 20s 3 30s 4 40s 5 50s 6 60s 7 older 8 RE

62. What was the last year of schooling you completed? 76
1 less than 8th grade 2 some high school 3 high school degree
4 some college 5 college degree(s) 8 RE

63. Finally, what is your race? 77
1 white 2 black 3 other 8 RE

Those are all the questions. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation. 78
SEX 1 male 2 female